REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16, 20-22, and 26, which are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-16, 20-22, and 26 stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6-14, 16, and 20-22 herein. No new matter is added by the amendments. In view of the following, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 3-24 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 20-22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bjorn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,222) in view of Bronson et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0002380). Applicant shall discuss the deficiencies of the teaching of Bjorn et al. and Bronson et al., alone or in combination, with respect to amended independent claim 1 below. The reasons for patentability of claim 1 also apply with equal weight to claims 2-9, which are dependent of claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, a file processing apparatus comprising a computer processor and an attribute input unit that acquires from the computer processor an attribute value for at least one file with a set of attributes, in order to represent the intended file as having a physical weight and density, said set of attributes comprising: the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. The file processing apparatus

also comprises a comparison processing unit, which compares the value of the attribute with a reference value of an environment (e.g., the surface or the bottom of a water environment), and a position determining unit, which sets a relative display position of a predetermined object in the environment, within a range of motion defined by the reference value of the environment, wherein the relative display position represents the density of the attribute relative to the reference value in the environment, and wherein the relative display position is set based on a result obtained from the comparison processing unit. Further, a display processing unit visually represents the value of the attribute in terms of whether the density of the predetermined object is more or less dense, and the relative display position of the predetermined object is set by the position determining unit, subject to a buoyancy force of the environment exerted upon the predetermined object visually represented by the display processing unit. The buoyancy force of the environment exerted upon the predetermined object is in at least one direction, in order to display the predetermined object at the relative display position within the range of motion set forth in the environment. Claims 10, 12, 14, and 20-22 have also been amended to include features of the above.

Applicant respectfully acknowledges Examiner's concession that Bjorn et al. does not show the relative display position represents density and further a virtual buoyancy force exerted upon a predetermined object. However, in the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner states that Brosnan et al. teaches the relative display position represents density (Brosnan, paragraph [0073], "the physical properties may include density") and that Bjorn et al. discloses the need for density (citing Bjorn et al., col. 8, lines 1-5). However, as amended, the relative display position represents the density of the attribute relative to the reference value of the environment in the

present invention. Both Bjorn and Brosnan are silent as to the relative display position representing density of the attribute relative to an environmental reference value. In Brosnan et al., force equations are applied to an object to calculate the object trajectory, while optionally factoring in the density of the object. Likewise, in Bjorn et al., the Examiner interprets the shopping lists per magnet as density. However, density is not used in Bjorn to be compared to a reference value of the environment. Therefore, Brosnan et al. and Bjorn et al. are silent as to a reference value of an environment that the density of an object is to be compared.

The Examiner contends that Bjorn et al. teaches the aspect of the present invention of a comparison processing tool that compares the value of an attribute (of a file to be represented as a predetermined object) with a reference value. However, the present invention, as amended recites that the reference value is a reference value of an environment, which Bjorn et al. does not teach.

In the Examiner's citation, Bjorn et al. discloses a GUI with a refrigerator magnet metaphor, in which an application may be associated with a magnet on the screen. The virtual magnets of Bjorn et al. have magnetic properties where two magnets may attract or repel one another other. The Examiner argues that the magnet in Bjorn et al. is equivalent to a predetermined object in the present invention and that the a virtual magnet serves as reference to other magnets, i.e., the way one magnet attracts and repels each other magnet serves as a reference of comparison for other magnets. However, there is no environmental reference value in Bjorn et al. to which an object's attribute can compare. The magnets in Bjorn et al. are influenced with respect to the magnetic properties of other magnets, but magnets are not affected

by a reference value of their environment: "[t]he position of the virtual magnet remains substantially where the user left it, subject to possible adjustments made by the magnet movement state." (See Bjorn, col. 7, lines 19-22) The environment of the refrigerator has no effect on the magnets, and the magnet movement state, which influences a magnet, the state in which magnets attract or repel is solely dependent on other magnets (and the user's movement of them), not the environment. Therefore, there is no reference value of an environment to be compared.

In contrast, in the present invention, a comparison unit compares the attribute with a reference value of an environment, for example, the top or bottom of a water environment. The present invention shows objects moving up and down based on a reference value that is represented in the environment (e.g., the top of the water is the max value of an object's attribute). The attribute of the predetermined object in the present invention does not compare itself with another attribute of another predetermined object, as it would in Bjorn et al. Therefore, Bjorn et al. does not teach this aspect because Bjorn is silent as to an attribute being compared to an environment reference.

Additionally, Bjorn et al. does not teach that the relative display position represents the density of the attribute relative to the reference value in the environment, wherein the relative display position is set based on a result of the comparison processing unit, as recited in the amended claims. In the present invention, when the comparison processing unit compares the attribute of a file with the reference value of the environment, the relative display position of a predetermined object is set based on the comparison result. Bjorn et al., in contrast, determines

the position of the magnets based on where the user leaves the magnet and secondarily the effect of magnetic properties while the user is holding the magnet. (See Id., col. 7, lines 9-22, "[A] virtual magnet in an idle state 201 will transition to a magnet movement state 205 in response to a drag operation. When the drag operation is complete (i.e., when the finger is lifted away from the touch screen surface), the virtual magnet 107 leaves the magnet movement state 205 and returns to the idle state 201.") Bjorn et al. explicitly shows that movement of a magnet must occur when the user engages in a movement state and physically moves the magnet. The position of the magnet is determined by the position where the user has left the magnet to return to its idle state. Likewise, the magnetic properties of repelling and attracting of other magnets occurs while the user is interacting with the magnet to determine its position. (See Id., col. 7, lines 47-48, "one virtual magnet 107 will move towards another that is 'held' in place by user interaction") Therefore, the relative position of a magnet in Bjorn et al. is based solely on user interaction, or rather, the place where the user places the magnet.

The present invention, on the other hand, determines the relative display position relative to the reference value in the environment, wherein the relative display position is set based on a result of the comparison processing unit. As shown above, there is no reference value of an environment in Bjorn et al., and the reference is silent as to determining the position of an object based on comparison of an attribute and a reference value of an environment. Therefore, Bjorn et al. does not teach one or more of the aspects of the present invention.

Lastly, claim 1 as amended recites that an attribute value is acquired for at least one file with a set of attributes, the set of attributes of an intended file comprising: the date and time of

file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. The Examiner states that, in Bjorn et al., a weight may be set by a user to teach the importance set by the user. However, this point is not taught by the reference to show importance. Bjorn et al. states that "virtual magnets can be assigned different virtual masses or weights that give them different properties when moved and when they interact with one another." (See Id., col. 7, lines 55-57). Bjorn et al. is silent as to a weight representing importance, as it is stated in the reference that a magnet's weight is made heavier or lighter to affect the drag or magnetic property of the magnet. Furthermore, the Examiner's citation of a heavier magnet holding more than one shopping list is not synonymous with the magnet being more important. From the Examiner's own admission above, the magnet made heavier by, for example, the presence of more than one shopping list is a representation of the magnet's capacity or "density," as the Examiner has equated. Bjorn et al. is silent as to importance of a magnet and does not show that a magnet is more important based on how many items the magnet is "holding."

In addition, a file in the present invention has a set of attributes comprising: the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. An attribute of a file with this set of attributes is compared with the reference value of the environment. Bjorn et al. is silent as to a file with the above set of attributes, meaning, that the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the type of file determined by data format or file

24

usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating (among other attributes) are not represented by a magnet in Bjorn et al. Therefore, the reference is deficient and does not teach one or more of the aspects of the present invention.

In view of at least the aforementioned, it can be concluded that Brosnan et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Bjorn et al. and fails to disclose: (i) the relative display position represents the density of an attribute relative to the reference value in the environment; (ii) the presence of a reference value of an environment; (iii) the relative display position is based on the comparison of the attribute and the reference value in the environment; and (iv) the set of attributes of an intended file comprises the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. As such, the teachings of Bjorn et al. and Brosnan et al., either alone or in combination, do not result in the invention of claim 1, and therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 10, 12, 14, and 20-22 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and have been rejected by the Examiner over Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al. Although claims 10, 12, 14, and 20-22 are of differing scope from claim 1, they do share some common features with claim 1, specifically the features discusses above with respect to the patentability of claim 1 over Bjorn et al. and Brosnan et al. Therefore, Applicant's arguments as to the deficiencies of Bjorn et al. and Brosnan et al. regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 10, 12, 14, and 20-22 with regard to, but not limited by: (i) the relative display position represents

the density of an attribute relative to the reference value in the environment; (ii) the presence of a reference value of an environment; (iii) the relative display position is based on the comparison of the attribute and the reference value in the environment; and (iv) the set of attributes of an intended file comprises the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. Therefore, claims 10, 12, 14, and 20-22 are patentable.

Hence, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's § 103 claim rejections be withdrawn with respect to these independent claims and claims 13, 16, and 26 depending therefrom.

At pages 24-25 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al. and further in view of Vaananen et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0175896 A1). Applicant traverses the rejection and submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al. and Vaananen et al., alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the independent claims from which the subject claims depend.

In particular, claims 2 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. The deficiencies of Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al., as they concern the independent claims, were discussed above. As the teachings of Vaananen et al. do not cure such deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection of the subject claims be

withdrawn. More particularly, Vaananen et al. fails to disclose, among other things: (i) the relative display position represents the density of an attribute relative to the reference value in the environment; (ii) the presence of a reference value of an environment; (iii) the relative display position is based on the comparison of the attribute and the reference value in the environment; and (iv) the set of attributes of an intended file comprises the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. In view of at least the foregoing, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

At page 25 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 7-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al. and further in view of Adler et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0175896 A1). Applicant traverses the rejection and submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al. and Adler et al., alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the independent claims from which the subject claims depend.

In particular, claims 7-8 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively. The deficiencies of Bjorn et al. in view of Brosnan et al., as they concern the independent claims, were discussed above. As the teachings of Adler et al. do not cure such deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn. More particularly, Adler et al. fails to disclose, among other things: (i) the relative display position represents the density of an attribute relative to the reference value in the environment; (ii) the

presence of a reference value of an environment; (iii) the relative display position is based on the comparison of the attribute and the reference value in the environment; and (iv) the set of attributes of an intended file comprises the date and time of file preparation, the date and time of a file update, the importance of the file set by the user, the type of file determined by data format or file usage, the number of times that the file has been updated, and a parameter indicating the frequency of file updating. In view of at least above, it is also requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Favorable reconsideration, is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Pedro C. Fernandez/
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6311
Fax: (212) 940-8986
Docket No.: SCEP 20.732 (100809-00225)
PCF:fd